

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/914,255	GERSTENMAYER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Shun Lee	2878	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Shun Lee. (3) Michael Casey (40,294).  
 (2) Zachary Stern (54,719) 703-413-6509. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 22 April 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 18-27 and 29-34.

Identification of prior art discussed: Charpak.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant argues that independent claim 18 and claims depending therefrom are allowable since Charpak only disclose cylindrical channels (see attached 413A).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### **Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### **Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)**

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  


(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Docket No: 212701US

<b>Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form</b>					
Application No.: <u>09/914,255</u>	First Named Applicant: <u>Gerstenmeyer</u>				
Examiner: <u>S. Lee</u>	Art Unit: <u>2878</u>	Status of Application: _____			
<b>Tentative Participants:</b>					
(1) <u>Zachary Stern</u>	(2) <u>Michael Casey</u>				
(3) <u>Shun Lee</u>	(4) _____				
Proposed Date of Interview: <u>4/22/04</u>	Proposed Time: <u>3 pm</u>				
(1) [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Telephonic	(2) [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Personal	(3) [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Video Conference			
Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] YES		[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NO			
If yes, provide brief description: _____					
<b>Issues To Be Discussed</b>					
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>IDS rejection</u>			[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
(2) <u>102(e)</u>	<u>Claims 18-26</u>	<u>Charpak</u>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
(3) <u>103(a)</u>	<u>Claims 27 and 29-34</u>	<u>Charpak and others</u>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
(4) _____			[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	[ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
[ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Continuation Sheet Attached					
<b>Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:</b>					
<p>Discuss features of the claimed invention as distinguished from the structure described by Charpak. In particular, Charpak discloses tube-like micro channels with circular openings on the face of the detector block, which is different than the claimed approach having parallel slits on the face of the detector block. Discuss objection to IDS.</p>					
An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on <u>4/22/04</u> .					
<b>NOTE:</b>					
This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).					
This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.					
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)			 (Examiner/SPE Signature)		

presented Claim 18 and Claim 28, which was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. In addition, new Claim 37 is added to present features similar to Claim 36 with a slightly varied scope. Accordingly, new Claims 36 and 37 are believed to be allowable.

In addition, applicants and applicants' representatives thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a personal interview with applicants' representatives on April 22, 2004. During the interview, the rejections noted in the outstanding Office Action were discussed, and the Examiner agreed to reconsider the claims based on the arguments presented. Arguments and claim amendments presented during the interview are reiterated below. In addition, new arguments are presented below to further distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references.

*(Interview record attached)*

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that French Patent No. 2 739 941 identified in the IDS filed November 26, 2001 was not considered because a copy of this reference was not in the file, although corresponding U.S. Patent No. 6,133,575 was available. Accordingly, a copy of French Patent No. 2 739 941, dated April 18, 1997, is provided and applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate consideration of this reference.

Further, regarding the objection to the specification, a substitute specification is provided including the corrections identified in the outstanding Office Action, as well as correction of other minor informalities. It is believed no new matter is added.

In addition, regarding the objections to Claim 28 and the rejections of Claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 28, 33, and 34 are amended in light of the comments in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these objections and rejections be withdrawn.